

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA**

United States of America,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 1:22-cr-41

Christopher Agbaje,
d/b/a Ace Telecommunications & Consultancy
Services, Inc.,
d/b/a Acorin USA, LLC,

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR REVIEW OF DETENTION ORDER

[¶ 1] THIS MATTER comes before the Court on a Request for Review of Detention Order filed by the Defendant on March 13, 2024. Doc. No. 29. The Defendant asks the Court to vacate United States’ Magistrate Judge Clare R. Hochhalter’s Order (Doc. No. 28) denying the Defendant’s Motion for Release from Custody. Id. The United States filed a Response on March 13, 2024. Doc. No. 30

[¶ 2] The Defendant only asks the Court to review Magistrate Judge Hochhalter’s Order for purportedly referencing his release plan to the city of Burnsville, Minnesota. According to the Defendant, his plan calls for his release to Barnsville, Minnesota, which is within 30 minutes from his Defense Counsel’s Office. Burnseville is hours away from Defense Counsel. This is insufficient to warrant review of Magistrate Judge Hochhalter’s Order. Even if the Defendant’s proposed release plan were to release him to the same city as Defense Counsel’s office, that would not obviate the need for him to remain detained pending trial. The Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Hochhalter that the Defendant is a flight risk. He has no connection to the District of North

Dakota. He was indicted by the Grand Jury on March 22, 2022. Doc. No. 1. He was not arrested on the warrant until March 19, 2023, while in the United Kingdom. Doc. No. 20. He contested extradition until November 16, 2023, at which point he agreed to extradition. Id. Regardless of his potential release location, he constitutes a flight risk.

[¶ 3] In short, the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the record, the Defendant’s request, and Magistrate Judge Hochhalter’s Order. The Court agrees with the analysis and conclusion of Magistrate Judge Hochhalter’s Order and hereby adopts it on this *de novo* review. See United States v. Cook, 87 F.4th 920, 924-25 (8th Cir. 2023) (“If the district court agrees fully with the magistrate’s order and reasons, it may adopt the order. Here, the district court reviewed the same record and factual findings and agreed fully with the magistrate judge’s decision. Adopting that decision ‘obviate[d] the need for the district court to prepare its own written findings of fact and statement of reasons.’” (cleaned up) (quoting United States v. King, 849 F.2d 485, 490 (11th Cir. 1988))). Accordingly, the Defendant’s Request for Review of Magistrate Judge’s Detention Order is **DENIED**.

[¶ 4] **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED March 27, 2024.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Traynor', written over a horizontal line.

Daniel M. Traynor, District Judge
United States District Court